

**To:** Havard, James[Havard.James@epa.gov]; Monschein, Eric[Monschein.Eric@epa.gov]; Holdsworth, Susan[Holdsworth.Susan@epa.gov]; Young, Dwane[Young.Dwane@epa.gov]  
**Cc:** Martinez, Menchu[martinez.menchu-c@epa.gov]; Fowler, Jamie[Fowler.Jamie@epa.gov]; Peterson, Carol[Peterson.Carol@epa.gov]; Chemerys, Ruth[Chemerys.Ruth@epa.gov]; Gordon, Lisa Perras[Gordon.Lisa-Perras@epa.gov]; Reems, Shera[Reems.Shera@epa.gov]  
**From:** Reems, Shera  
**Sent:** Mon 1/12/2015 6:54:02 PM  
**Subject:** Jim, Eric, Susan, and Dwane: [Draft 2016 IR Memo](#)  
**MAIL RECEIVED:** Mon 1/12/2015 6:54:06 PM  
[Implementation of the Vision 2016 IR Memo Dec 19 Draft for JH EM review.docx](#)  
[2016 IR Memo Revised Timeline.docx](#)  
[Draft 2016 IR Memo for Web Site.docx](#)

Hi Jim, Eric, Susan, and Dwane (cc: to everyone that contributed language) – please find attached a [draft 2016 IR Memo](#). As you review, please consider a few comments, which I’ve noted below. Since this is a rather long email, let me know if you would like to set aside time to chat prior to you all diving in and spending time to review and comment on the draft [IR memo](#). As for timing, it would be great if you could all provide comments by February 6th.

Cheers – Shera

1) [303\(d\)](#) Vision: This piece is currently being reviewed by Jim/Eric, so I inserted ‘placeholder’ in the [draft 2016 IR memo](#), and I’ve attached this write-up as a separate document. Given the linkage to the computational guidance for the new [303\(d\)](#) measures, this piece was ‘fast tracked’ and will be shared with Regions/states when we send out the next iteration of the computational guidance, which should be soon.

2) Timeliness of IR submittals and review of [303\(d\)](#) lists: Removed this section, and I made reference to this being important in the ATTAINS section. For me, this section has become meaningless by itself. We included this piece in the cover memo for the 2010 [IR memo](#), then in memo itself since the 2012 [IR memo](#), yet things haven’t really gotten better. Since the WQF/ATTAINS Redesign has a goal of improving the IR process, it seems better suited in the ATTAINS section. Here is a quick snapshot

	2010 Reporting Cycle	2012 Reporting Cycle	2014 Reporting Cycle	2010 Reporting Cycle	2012 Reporting Cycle
Number of lists submitted by April 1 of reporting cycle year	16	10	8		
Number of lists submitted by April 30 of reporting cycle year	6	4	1		
Number of lists submitted by September 30 of reporting cycle year	9	13	7		
Number of lists submitted after September 30 of reporting cycle year	25	21	2		
Number of <a href="#">303(d)</a> list reviews completed within 30 days					

Number of 303(d) list reviews completed within 60 days				8
Number of 303(d) list reviews completed within 90 days				3
Number of 303(d) list reviews greater than 90 days				36
Total	56	48	18	54

Note: for the 2012 reporting cycle, there are 2 lists for which we don't know actual submission date so not included  
Note: for the 2012 reporting cycle, there are 2 lists for which we are not able to calculate EPAs review piece so not included  
Column F

3) Clarification on the assessment and assignment of waters to Category 4C: You asked Jamie to provide comments on this write-up several months ago, so I've gone ahead and inserted her comments to you. Tom Wall, initially, had asked to see this piece in advance; however, that doesn't make sense now.

4) Cover memo: This piece is written closer to the finalization of the memo. This time around, we intend to address antidegradation and make note that EPA continues to work on the development of guidance for states. Recall that we decided to take this reference out of the memo itself, and to include in the cover memo.

5) Timeline: I've updated the timeline, see attached word document. At some point, it would be good to communicate this timeline to the Regions and states, but you will need to determine what should change, first.